

Docket No. F-8435

Ser. No. 10/511,958

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are now pending in this application. Claims 15 and 16 are allowed. Claims 1-9 and 11 are rejected. Claims 1 and 12-14 are objected to. Claim 11 is cancelled herein. New claims 15-21 are added. Claims 1-7 and 14 are amended herein. Formal matters are attended to that were not addressed by the Examiner and accordingly are considered unrelated to substantive patentability issues. For the convenience of the Examiner, APPENDIX I is provided herewith having a complete set of pending claims with all amendments effected therein.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 10 is objected for reciting "reflective films." Claim 10 is amended to recite "a reflective film" in accordance with the suggestion of the Office Action. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-14 are indicated to contain allowable subject matter but are objected to for their dependence on rejected base claims. Claims 10 and 13 are amended to stand in independent form incorporating the limitations of the claims from which they depend. Withdrawal of the objections to claims 10 and 13 are respectfully requested.

Docket No. F-8435

Ser. No. 10/511,958

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Mitsui high tec reference, (JP 2001267609, hereinafter "Mitsui"). Applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections. "Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the 'claim'* *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference is deficient with regard to the following.

Claim 1 is amended to include a portion of claim 6 and to recite that the semiconductor elements in each of the rows or columns which are parallel to the conductive direction are connected in series while the semiconductor elements of each of the rows or columns, perpendicular to the conductive direction, are connected in parallel. The Mitsui reference fails to show such a connection arrangement.

The structure shown in the Mitsui reference provides a planar array of semiconductor elements which are interconnected by a conductive mesh 11 and conductive feedthrough members 13. The conductive mesh 11 connects together like sides of the pn junctions of the elements. Hence, since all the elements have a like terminal connected in common by the mesh 11, the elements cannot be

Docket No. F-8435

Ser. No. 10/511,958

connected in series as is required by claim 1, either in the rows or columns, since a series connection requires unlike terminals of the pn junctions to be connected to each other.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-4 and 6 particularly describe and distinctly claim elements not disclosed in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-4 and 6 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 5 is rejected as obvious over the Mitsui reference in view of the Hamakawa reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 7-9 are rejected as obvious over Mitsui reference in view of the Nakata '073 reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

The Hamakawa reference is cited for teaching a hard synthetic covering material. The Nakata '073 reference is cited for teaching semiconductor element configurations. It is respectfully submitted that the proffered combination of references cannot render the rejected claims obvious because the secondary

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 2 2 2007

Docket No. F-8435

Scr. No. 10/511,958

references do not provide the teaching noted above with respect to the anticipation rejection that is absent from the primary Mitsui reference. Thus, the combination of prior art references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 5 and 7-9 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

CLAIM FEES

One claim in excess of twenty is added. Two independent claims in excess of three are added. Accordingly, please charge the fee of \$450.00 to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Applicant respectfully requests a two month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. Please charge the fee of \$450.00 for the extension of time to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Docket No. F-8435

Ser. No. 10/511,958

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By F J Jordan
Frank J. Jordan
Reg. No. 20,456
Attorney for Applicants
and,

By H F Ruschmann
Herbert F. Ruschmann
Reg. No. 35,341
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340